DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 126 CE 003 386

TITLE	To Amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1972: Hearing Before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Third Congress: First Session on H.R. 8443.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Conservation (Environment); *Conservation Education; *Federal Legislation; Participant Satisfaction; Program Descriptions; Public Support; State Federal Support; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Youth Conservation Corps

ABSTRACT

The pamphlet reports on the hearing before the Select Subcommittee on H.R. 8443, a bill to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1972 to expand and make permanent the Youth Conservation Corps (YCC). It contains the text of H.R. 8443 and statements pertaining to program support, operation, and participation from: Richard R. Hite, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, U.S. Department of the Interior; Governor H. Aker, Director of the Office of Manpower Training and Youth Activities; Sue Knott, YCC Program Director; Sue Moser and Jeff Sager, program participants; James Schafer, YCC Program Director; Paul A Vander Myde, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Conservation, Research, and Education, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Robert Lake of the Forest Service; and the Honorable Les Aspin, Congressional Representative from Wisconsin. (NH)

ED105126

TO AMEND THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1972

CE
JAN 23 1975

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 8433

A BILL TO AMEND THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1972 (PUBLIC LAW 92-597, 86 STAT. 1319) TO EXPAND AND MAKE PERMANENT THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 16, 1973

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
33-161 WASHINGTON : 1974

CE003384

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLO, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
JACK F. KEMP, New York
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey, *Chairman*

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILIP BURTON, California
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
HERMAN BADILLO, New York

MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of H.R. 8433	1
Statement of—	
Hite, Richard R., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, accompanied by Governor H. Aker, Director of the Office of Manpower Training and Youth Activities	5
Knott, Miss Sue, YCC Program Director	22
Moser, Sue, program participant	25
Sager, Jeff, program participant	26
Schafer, James, YCC Program Director	24
Vander Myde, Paul A., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Conservation, Research, and Education, U.S. Department of Agriculture, accompanied by Robert Lake of the Forest Service	7
Aspin, Hon. Les, a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, prepared statement	40

TO AMEND THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT OF 1972

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:45 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Lloyd Meeds, presiding.

Present: Representatives Meeds and Dellenback.

Staff members present: Joseph Alviani, associate counsel; Alexandra J. Kisla, clerk; Steve Ponder, professional staff member; and Martin L. LaVor, staff minority legislative associate.

[Text of H.R. 8433 follows:]

[H.R. 8433, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-597, 86 Stat. 1319) to expand and make permanent the Youth Conservation Corps and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of October 27, 1972 (86 Stat. 1319) is amended to read as follows:

"POLICY AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 1. The Congress finds that the Youth Conservation Corps has demonstrated a high degree of success as a pilot program wherein American youth, representing all segments of society, have benefited by gainful employment in the healthful outdoor atmosphere of the national park system, the national forest system, other public land and water areas of the United States and by their employment have developed, enhanced, and maintained the natural resources of the United States, and whereas in so doing the youth have gained an understanding and appreciation of the Nation's environment and heritage equal to one full academic year of study, it is accordingly the purpose of this Act to expand and make permanent the Youth Conservation Corps and thereby further the development and maintenance of the natural resources by America's youth, and in so doing to prepare them for the ultimate responsibility of maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

"YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

"SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter refered to as the 'Corps'). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, possessions, trust territories, or Commonwealth of Puerto Rico who

have attained age fifteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining the lands and waters of the United States.

"(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications with all Corps members receiving compensation consistent with work accomplished, and with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

"SECRETARIAL DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 3. (a) In carrying out this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

"(1) determine the areas under their administrative jurisdictions which are appropriate for carrying out the programs using employees of the Corps;

"(2) determine with other Federal agencies, the areas under the administrative jurisdiction of these agencies which are appropriate for carrying out programs using members of the Corps, and determine and select appropriate work and education programs and projects for participation by members of the Corps;

"(3) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps, except that all members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for the purpose of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code.

"(4) provide for such transportation, lodging, subsistence, and other services and equipment as they may deem necessary or appropriate for the needs of members of the Corps in their duties;

"(5) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members; and

"(6) provide to the extent possible, that permanent or semi-permanent facilities used as Corps camps be made available to local schools, school districts, State junior colleges and universities, and other education institutions for use as environmental/ecological education camps during periods of nonuse by the Corps program.

Costs for operations, maintenance, and staffing of Corps camp facilities during periods of use by non-Corps programs as well as any liability for personal injury or property damage stemming from such use shall be the responsibility of the entity or organization using the facility and shall not be a responsibility of the Secretaries or the Corps.

"(b) Existing but unoccupied Federal facilities and surplus or unused equipment (or both), of all types, including military facilities and equipment, shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps, where appropriate and with the approval of the Federal agency involved. To minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for at least five years for the operation of any Youth Conservation Corps project.

"GRANT PROGRAM FOR STATE PROJECTS

"SEC. 4.(a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly establish a program under which grants shall be made to States to assist them in meeting the cost of projects for the employment of young men and women to develop, preserve, and maintain non-Federal public lands and waters within the States. For purposes of this section, the term 'States' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa.

"(b)(1) No grant may be made under this section unless an application therefor has been submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. Such application shall be in such form, and submitted in such manner, as the Secretaries shall jointly by regulation prescribe, and shall contain—

"(A) assurances satisfactory to the Secretaries that individuals employed under the project for which the application is submitted shall (i) have attained the age of fifteen but not attained the age of nineteen, (ii) be permanent residents of the United States or its territories, possessions, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, (iii) be employed without regard to the personnel laws, rules, and regulations applicable to full-time employees of the applicant, (iv) be employed for a period of not more than ninety days in any calendar year, and (v) be employed without regard to their sex or social, economic, or racial classification; and

"(B) such other information as the Secretaries may jointly by regulation prescribe.

"(2) The Secretaries may approve applications which they determine (A) meet the requirements of paragraph (1), and (B) are for projects which will further the development, preservation, or maintenance of non-Federal public lands or waters within the jurisdiction of the applicant.

"(c)(1) The amount of any grant under this section shall be determined jointly by the Secretaries, except that no grant for any project may exceed 80 per centum of the cost (as determined by the Secretaries) of such project.

"(2) Payments under grants under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and at such intervals and on such conditions as the Secretaries find necessary.

"(d) Thirty per centum of the sums appropriated under section 6 for any fiscal year shall be made available for grants under this section for such fiscal year.

"SECRETARIAL REPORTS

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture shall annually prepare a joint report detailing the activities carried out under this Act and providing recommendations. Each report for a program year shall be submitted concurrently to the President and the Congress not later than April 1 following the close of that program year.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed $150,000,000 for each fiscal year, which amounts shall be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out this Act shall remain available for obligation and expenditure until the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which appropriated.".

Mr. MEEDS. The Select Subcommittee on Labor of the full House Education and Labor Committee will be in session to take testimony on H.R. 8433 and related bills introduced by Mr. Esch, myself, and 58 of our colleagues.

This legislation would authorize the expansion of the employment opportunities in the highly successful Youth Conservation Corps to a minimum of 150,000 young people. The $150 million annual authorization would not only provide meaningful employment for young people, but the taxpayer will get three-quarters of the money back in the form of improvements on public lands.

There is no disagreement that the YCC 3-year pilot program has been a resounding success. Indeed, I know of no one who would deny that. About 3,000 young people, ages 15 to 18, have found meaningful work each year on public lands throughout this Nation. Currently the unemployment rate of this group is more than 14 percent.

Despite the appreciation of what the YCC has achieved, I am sure that the administration witnesses before us today will in all probability follow the White House line and oppose very substantial ex-

pansion. I think that when we hear from some of the actual participants and their supervisors today it will become apparent why this program must be made permanent and must be expanded.

I saw their handiwork this summer myself in the North Cascades, and believe me it is very impressive. Simply stated, the YCC must be expanded if we are to make a dent in youth unemployment. Second, the work needed to be performed on our public lands dwarfs any cuts that we are likely to feel under the proposed legislation.

The proposed bills expand the program to June 1974, to 150,000 youths, and sets a permanent authorization level of $150 million. Although Congress raised the authorization levels for fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974, the administration requested only enough appropriations to employ 10,000 young people in the current summer and far fewer than those willing to work on jobs that need to be done.

A pioneering State participation cost-sharing project was also authorized but due to budget problems only 3,500 young people were employed last summer. H.R. 8433 expands the authorization to $150 million, and continues backing the cost-sharing program; indeed it makes that a permanent program also.

The need for conservation activities on State lands is now at least as intense as the need on federally owned land. In addition, by the State cost-sharing program we can get some of these programs where more young people are in the East where there are not as many Federal public lands. Considering the success of the youth conservation program, it is time that this program be made permanent and expanded to meet both the summer employment needs and the maintenance needs on our public lands.

Does the gentleman from Oregon have any opening statement?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would say only briefly that I had the opportunity, during the August recess, to go through several of the areas in my State where the youth conservation program is operating. I found that the accomplishments of these young people working in the national forests on one or another of these programs, have proven extremely valuable in our area. I find myself much more attracted by this kind of program than when I first began wrestling with the idea in committee several years ago. Consequently, I am very much interested in the testimony we will hear today, and very much interested in what the general thrust of the committee's discussion will be as to what degree we should move forward with this.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you.

For our first witnesses, we will call a panel of the administering agents, the persons from the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. We are delighted to have Richard Hite, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, and Mr. Paul Vander Myde, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Conservation, Research and Education, Department of Agriculture.

Nice to see you.

You gentlemen both have prepared statements. You may read them into the record, or you may summarize them and enter them in the record, either way.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD R. HITE, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY GOV. H. AKER, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANPOWER TRAINING AND YOUTH ACTIVITIES

Mr. HITE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may initiate the reading, and I will read substantially the prepared statement that you have before you.

Mr. MEEDS. Fine. Please read that.

Mr. HITE. Mr Chairman, it is a privilege for me to appear before this distinguished committee of the House of Representatives to testify on H.R. 8433, a bill to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1972, to authorize a permanent basis annual appropriations of a $150 million for the Youth Conservation Corps program.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, this is the third year for the YCC program. This summer, we are jointly operating, with the Department of Agriculture, 102 camps. These camps are accommodating over 3,500 young men and women from all the 50 States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. Most of these camps are residential and coeducational.

We are pleased with the progress of this program during its first 2 years of operation. It has been successful in meeting many of the objectives of the original legislation, and while we are continually attempting to improve the administration of the program, we are pleased to be able to report that it has been, and continues to be, a well-administered program.

The progress of the program to date relates directly to the recognition by Congress, supported by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, that a well-planned and deliberate approach was necessary in order to design and implement a cost-effective program. Such an approach was also necessary to iron out the inevitable administrative and operational problems which will occur in any new program.

As you know, gentlemen, we did experience some difficulties in implementing this program during the first 2 years of its pilot operation. However, the evaluation results show that continual improvement in the program occurred in 1972, the second year of the program, from the experience gained in 1971. Further improvement as we implement the recommendations of the earlier evaluations is expected in this summer's program, the 1973 program, and certainly in the forthcoming 1974 program.

In spite of the progress of the program during the past 2 years, we do not recommend passage of this proposed legislation in its present form. As you know, Public Law 92-597 authorized $60 million for the YCC program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. We believe it is important to maintain fiscal flexibility in determining the future funding level for the program. We, therefore, recommend that further authorization levels be for "such sums as may be necessary." However, if the committee feels that this program should be continued at the current level of $60 million, the Department of the Interior would have no objection.

We feel enactment of the legislation in its present form would be unwise for four reasons.

33-161—74——2

First, despite the considerable capability and dedication of our staff personnel, we could not expand the program from its current level of funding to the level proposed without seriously diluting the program quality and encountering serious administrative and operational difficulties. As a result, we feel we would run the risk of failing to meet the hopes and expectations of this act as well as our own personal standards of excellence.

Second, from a budgetary standpoint we also believe that immediate expansion of the program to the level proposed is unwise. As you well know, we are experiencing in every program area of the budget severe fiscal constraints. The inflationary pressures of the economy together with the limited financial resources at our disposal dictate that we must exercise fiscal restraint. We cannot, therefore, support any spending authorization which does not take into account the overall ceiling on our financial resources.

Third, the proposed legislation would provide for a permanent grant program for State projects. In the fiscal year 1974 program, funds will be available for State grants on a pilot basis. As you know, as yet we have no experience with State grant programs. This new aspect deserves the same careful study and development as was provided in the pilot YCC program. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, we recommended that this State grant program not be made permanent as contemplated in H.R. 8433, but rather, be continued on a pilot basis.

Lastly, we believe it is incumbent on us to continually evaluate the program's effectiveness and our capability for delivery.

Some of the questions which we believe merit continuing examination and consideration are as follows: (1) long-term effects on knowledge, attitude, and behavior of participants; (2) most effective kinds, size and length of camps; (3) comparative effectiveness of educational aspects of YCC; (4) best way to assure effective approaches to educational parts of the program; (5) salary level that is appropriate for participants; (6) ways in which work done by YCC participants can be directed toward the highest priority needs of the agencies; (7) costs of YCC work if obtained by customary means.

In our program to date, we have learned through the University of Michigan evaluation and other monitoring devices that the benefits which these youth have gained from the program have been worthwhile. Learning to live with other young people representing all walks of life and all economic and racial backgrounds—discovering what it means to do a day's work for a day's pay, as well as being involved with the problems which face the Nation's environment—are experiences that can provide these young people with a new respect for our natural heritage and an awareness of their responsibilities as citizens of the United States.

The University of Michigan report of the 1972 program pointed out that the environmental knowledge of Corps members in each grade level increased approximately to the levels of Corps members 1 year ahead of them. The report concludes, therefore, based on these and other findings, that the learning of Corps members was equivalent to 1 academic year in a normal school setting. This indicates that young people can learn while doing, and this learning may be reinforced by a healthful outdoor atmosphere and good old honest hard work.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of the Interior firmly believes in the need to conserve, preserve, and maintain our vast natural resources and to protect our environment for the future of our young citizens. House of Representatives bill 8433 should, therefore, be geared to coincide with the capabilities of the departments to develop an orderly program consistent with the fiscal realities which we face.

We believe that a gradual development will enable us to maintain the quality of the program through continued evaluation. We also feel that if we go too far too fast, many of these goals may be lost.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

That concludes my statement. I will be happy to answer any questions that you have at the appropriate time.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, let us hear from Mr. Vander Myde first, and then we will have questions for both of you.

Incidentally, I am sorry. I forgot to acknowledge the presence at the witness table of the assistants of both the witnesses, and people who really made the program go—Governor Aker of the Interior Department, and Robert Lake of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture.

We are very delighted to see you gentlemen here also.

Please proceed, Mr. Secretary.

STATEMENT OF PAUL VANDER MYDE, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF CONSERVATION, RESEARCH AND EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY ROBERT LAKE, FORIST SERVICE

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We too appreciate this opportunity to participate in the consideration of legislation to expand the Youth Conservation Corps, a program which this Department jointly administers with the Department of the Interior.

As you know, we have just completed the third and final year of the YCC pilot program authorized by Public Law 91-378. This summer, some 3,500 young men and women, representing all socioeconomic levels and races, were engaged in conservation work-learning projects across the country at 102 YCC camps. Approximately 1,800 of these Corps members were in Forest Service administered camps. This brings the total employment figure for the 3-year pilot program to 9,771 youths.

The Department of Agriculture is pleased with the development and results of the YCC pilot program. In the first 2 years, $4,464,000 worth of high-priority conservation work has been accomplished on Federal lands. This means that for every dollar spent on the program, approximately 70 cents was returned to the Government in the form of conservation works and improvements on the public lands. But the program has also been valuable in terms other than the amount of work accomplished. Independent analysis of the YCC program by the University of Michigan indicated that in 1972 corpsmembers made gains in environmental knowledge approximately equal to a full year of high school.

We believe the accomplishments of the YCC pilot program are the result of working at manageable program levels and that the experience gained through the pilot program provides us a sound and orderly base for the 1974 program.

While initial results of the pilot program are positive and encouraging, these results do not sufficiently support the need for a greatly expanded YCC program of the scope proposed in H.R. 8433. Research by the Institute of Social Research of the University of Michigan also indicates that more evaluation is needed before a comprehensive, full-scale YCC effort is considered. For example, in its evaluation of the 1972 Youth Conservation Corps, the university recommended that further research be conducted on such facets of YCC as the length of camps, the residential nature and size of the camps, the long-range impact on and value of the program for corpsmembers, and the special needs of American Indian and black youth. The report also indicated that the educational aspect of the program needs additional administrative attention to assure that it is offering a fully integrated work-learning experience.

Under Public Law 92-597, which became law in October 1972, 1 more year was authorized for operating a Youth Conservation Corps program. As you know, this act extended YCC through 1974, increased the level of authorization for funding, and established a State grant pilot program. Under this authorization $10 million has been appropriated for fiscal year 1974. We anticipate that this will allow some 10,000 youths to be enrolled in Federal and State YCC projects during the summer of 1974. The nearly $3 million to be granted to the States for a pilot State operated YCC is a new aspect of our YCC efforts to date and deserves the same careful study and development provided in the initial pilot program.

In conclusion, this Department does not recommend the enactment of H.R. 8433 in its present form. The $450 million annual appropriation authorization proposed in H.R. 8433 far exceeds the capabilities of the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior to responsibly and effectively administer the Youth Conservation Corps program. Our experience to date indicates that the most effective approach to an expanded Youth Conservation Corps would be a gradual development of the program coupled with continued evaluation. A dramatic and sudden increase in the level of funding could seriously dilute program quality and produce numerous administrative and operation difficulties.

In determining future program levels, we believe it is most desirable to have adequate flexibility for funding YCC. Therefore, we recommend that future authorization levels be for "such sums as may be necessary." However, if the committee feels that this program should be continued at the current level of $60 million as authorized by Public Law 92-597, the Department of Agriculture would have no objection.

This concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman.

You have acknowledged the presence of Robert Lake, who is presently the Director of our Division of Manpower and Youth Conservation Programs. He has had the overall responsibility for directing the Forest Services' share of the YCC program. Both Mr. Lake and myself will be pleased to answer any questions you may have at this time.

Mr. MEEDS. All right. I will just start with where your statement ended, Mr. Vander Myde.

As near as we can calculate some $60 million would be equivalent to 60,000 young people in the program. I think that is about the ratio.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. I am curious. Testimony last year indicated a capability of 30,000 young people, I think, just in the Department of the Interior alone. I don't recall what the capability was with regard to the Forest Service or their conjecture at that time, the capability, but it must be at least 30,000, is it not? It must have been at least 30,000 a year ago.

Mr. LAKE. Yes, Congressman, we have updated that identification of capability, and the capability level we have currently and specifically identified at this time amounts to some 21,000 youth in 550 projects in the Department of Agriculture and Interior camps. This would assume a funding level of about $30 million, plus a State grant program. With the State grant program we believe the total would be about $43 million, or roughly 40,000 youth under our refined capability identification. We have made projections now—and they are just projections—to the $60 million level as well, but we have not made specific identification of projects at this time.

Mr. MEEDS. That is just the Forest Service?

Mr. LAKE. Yes. Actually it is a joint projection with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MEEDS. Then the level that you are saying 40,000, including the State grants, is that a joint projection?

Mr. LAKE. That is a joint projection, yes; a refined joint projection in which we have actually identified sites.

Mr. MEEDS. 40,000 would be on Federal property alone then, just the Interior and Agriculture, or would that be the State?

Mr. LAKE. It includes the State. We included that capability. This assumes that the State will actually apply for the grant money.

Mr. MEEDS. I don't understand. Now you said you had a $60 million capability. At least the way we have been operating in the past is that that would represent 60,000 young people.

Mr. LAKE. Yes, roughly.

Mr. MEEDS. You told me that there was a $60 million potential, but you have only identified 40,000 total positions here.

Mr. LAKE. Yes, $43 million including the State program grants which would be roughly 40,000 youth involved in the program.

Mr. MEEDS. $43 million?

Mr. LAKE. Yes; that is the more specific identification of their joint capability.

I yield.

Mr. DELLEBACK. Do I understand the component parts of your projected funding schedule to represent $43 million on Federal projects, and the other half on State projects?

Did you say that your projection for the Federal portion was about $21 million?

Mr. LAKE. 21,000 youth slots for 8 weeks.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And how many dollars?

Mr. LAKE. That means about $30 million. We get a little confused sometimes in our numbers here because we program on a basis of a

youth enrolled for 8 weeks. For instance, during this past summer we programed 2,800 youth for 8 weeks, but we actually involved 3,500 youth, so with 21,000 programed, I expect we would involve about 30,000 youth in the Federal program with the remainder in the State program.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And you could do that for about $30 million?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, for the Federal portion.

Mr. DELLENBACK. That is a joint projection for both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If you then stepped up the spending from $30 million to $43 million, you would step up the slots available from 30,000 slots to 41,000 slots?

Mr. LAKE. Roughly. The law provides that 30 percent of the funds will go to States under the grant program, so this is roughly $12 to $13 million, you see, on top of the $30 million, adding up to a total figure of $43 million.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I understand that your responses to Mr. Meeds' questions were based on what you have actually identified in the way of "hard" slots; you know the places they would be approximately; you know the number of slots in each camp; and you know this on a pretty definite basis.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Then do I understand correctly that you have made a very tentative estimate beyond the $43 million figure and said on a more vague basis you have programed to about $60 million?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If you took it that far, how many additional slots would you deem to be available? Second, how many of those would be Federal program slots and how many would be State program slots?

Mr. LAKE. The actual number of Federal program slots, this is 8-week slots, would be 28,000. In terms of the State it would be in terms of dollars. Roughly after the overhead costs are taken out of the grant program funds about $16 million. With States matching this, and assuming they match 50–50, which we are encouraging, this would result in approximately another 30,000 positions in the State program.

Mr. MEEDS. Let me interrupt right there so I don't lose track of it. How are you encouraging it? Are you saying that you must match at 50–50?

Mr. LAKE. We are saying that preference will be given to States who can match on a 50–50 basis, assuming competing applications.

Mr. MEEDS. Well now was that the intent of the law where we said that the Federal Government would provide up to 80 percent, I think, or maybe even 100 percent. There was 80 percent in there somehow.

Mr. LAKE. Yes. Up to 80 percent.

Mr. MEEDS. Whether or not a State will match 50–50, isn't the criteria that that State have young people and it have public lands that need attention, and that the Federal programs not be available because of the scarcity of Federal lands in the State?

Mr. LAKE. That is true.

Mr. MEEDS. Aren't those really the criteria?

Mr. LAKE. Those are the criteria, but within those there is the encouragement for the State carrying up to 50 percent of the cost, assuming——

Mr. MEEDS. Kind of self-imposed restraint by the department it sounds to me like because that certainly was not the intent of the committee in any way.

Mr. LAKE. It is self-imposed in terms of trying to get more participation, more youth involved in the program, but by the same token if we don't get the response on that basis there is the leeway.

Mr. MEEDS. Maybe we better draw some criteria right in this bill so you do what we want you to do.

Mr. LAKE. If that is what the Congress desires.

Mr. MEEDS. Well, I am sure that the Congress didn't desire that some States who (1) have public lands that need attention, who (2) have youth who need to be on those public lands and who (3) don't have the accessibility to Federal programs for their children because they don't have the Federal public lands in their State or near, I am sure the Congress intended that those States receive attention whether they can fund 50 percent or not.

Mr. LAKE. Yes; I believe we have been operating under the interpretation that up to 80 percent, or no more than 80 percent, would be paid by the Federal Government, and that those States who showed the interest in terms of paying more, assuming applications would otherwise meet the criteria which you have mentioned, would receive some preference.

Mr. MEEDS. How many State grants or how many State programs are operating presently?

Mr. LAKE. Next summer will be the first year of the State grant program, so we have not had a State program to date. This will be a new experience for us. We plan to give every State the opportunity to apply for the grant—in fact we already have, they have been contacted.

Mr. MEEDS. Have you determined which ones are going to be funded next year at this time?

Mr. LAKE. Not at this time. We have allowed for funding of a program in every State. In some cases this would be quite a small amount based upon the population and the fact that there is already a sizable Federal program, for instance, in the State, but every State will have the opportunity to apply for grant funds.

Mr. MEEDS. It is my understanding that the President has budgeted $10 million for this program for fiscal year 1974, is that correct?

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. MEEDS. And you are projecting your programs and your grants on that basis?

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. MEEDS. I have just one more question, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Let's assume at least for the moment that this program is as successful as everyone says it is, and let's assume that this administration decided to really put some impetus to the program, they decided finally that they liked it, and they were prepared to go ahead with it as a major national program, and the President passed the word down to your departments and said, "Let's go huckledebuck with this program." Let's assume those things.

Let's assume further, as I think I do and I think you do, that it is more sagacious to build up than to just have a crash program with 4 million kids all at one time, that the best approach is to escalate to

higher numbers. Again assuming that you are really told that this program is to be given a lot of attention and as much money as it needs, what kind of escalation would you suggest under those circumstances?

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Well, I think it is a very hypothetical situation, Mr. Chairman, that you have outlined for us.

Mr. MEEDS. It certainly is. It is kind of like smoking opium.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. It is.

Mr. MEEDS. All right. Let's smoke opium here for a while.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. We have not formulated the 1975 budget to this degree; however, we do see the problems that would be presented by extending the program at such a rapid rate with respect to the staffing of the camps, the facilities that would be needed, the equipment problems. To do this on a very rapid basis we feel would just result in seriously diluting the quality of the program.

Mr. MEEDS. All right. Assume that I agree with you. Now I am still asking you if you have any kind of professional opinion or does Mr. Lake or Mr. Aker have any kind of professional opinion as to what could be done and still keep the efficacy of the program and expand it very rapidly?

Mr. HITE. Mr. Chairman, we have testified that we see a hard program capability up to $43 million. We have projects in the States and we feel that that is a fairly firm projection for the expansion of the program. That is given all the assumptions that you have outlined for us, sir. Over and above that we have the problem of what tradeoffs will be made during the budget process, and what priorities will be lessened.

Mr. MEEDS. I thought I allayed your fear about those in my hypothetical question.

Mr. HITE. Well, you did, sir. In responding to that as I say, and as Mr. Lake indicated, we have a program fairly firmly delineated which would increase the program to a $30 million level plus the State grant program. However, in the real world are the employment limitations under which we acquire additional Corps staff.

Mr. MEEDS. Well, of course, if additional Corps staff means additional money, at least that is not the major factor in my hypothetical.

So you tell me you are really thinking big now, you are thinking in terms of $40 million for a total program.

Mr. HITE. Well, we can see this as a fairly firm plan and this is what led us, sir, to the position that we took in our mutual prepared statement with respect to the authorized amount.

Mr. MEEDS. Probably somebody could give us some figures, the number of unemployed youth in the summers from age 15 through 18, probably somewhere in the area of 16 million, 14 percent of the amount, and you are thinking about 43,000. Do you know how many applications they had for 3,000 slots 2 years ago?

Mr. AKER. Around 120,000.

Mr. MEEDS. Around 120,000 to 130,000 applications for 3,000 slots, and you are still thinking about 43,000?

Mr. HITE. Well, Mr. Chairman, one of your assumptions in your hypothesis was that we would gear up.

Mr. MEEDS. Right.

Mr. HITE. This is the problem which I believe Mr. Vander Myde cited with respect to getting qualified and competent staff and pro-

viding adequate facilities, obtaining adequate equipment. These things I think happen. It would have to happen in an orderly fashion. We are not quite sure how we will fare in the fairly significant jump. This was $10 million from a $3.5 million program.

Mr. MEEDS. It is going to be a shock to your system?

Mr. HITE. Well, sir, it will be——

Mr. MEEDS. From 3,000 to 10,000 young people?

Mr. HITE. It will be a question of doubling the number of tents for instance that Interior needs, and this creates a problem.

Mr. MEEDS. Do you know what the forest rangers on the ground tell me in my congressional district? They told me that they could increase this program in my congressional district by twentyfold just like that. Does that surprise you? Have you talked to the people on the ground?

Mr. HITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. Is this an exaggeration? Are the people in my congressional district exaggerating when they say they could increase the program twentyfold and handle it well? It is additional funding.

Mr. LAKE. It shows some real enthusiasm for the program.

Mr. MEEDS. They are enthusiastic about it, and so are the people on the ground in the Department of the Interior, very enthusiastic about it. In the North Cascades National Park the rangers are screaming for young people and indicate to me that they could put all kinds of them to work.

Mr. HITE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not deny the position that the people in your district on the ground who are actually operating with the young people take. However, I think from a national perspective that we have a problem on the method of selection and, logistical problems which I don't believe have been addressed in an adequate fashion by the Department.

Mr. MEEDS. I yield at this time to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So that I may see it clearly, would you help me trace the history of the growth of this program in the years that have gone by so far.

You have given us an indication that the 1973 figure is 102 camps, and that the number of participants in those 102 camps are about 3,500 participants. During fiscal 1973, you spent about $3.5 million, is that correct for the 1973 figures?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Can you give us the 1971 figures which compare with those? How many camps did we have in 1971?

Mr. LAKE. In 1971 we had an appropriation of $2.5 million. We had 64 camps with 2,676 youth participating.

Mr. DELLENBACK. What about 1972?

Mr. LAKE. In 1972 we had a $3.5 million appropriation with 3,495 youth participating in 97 camps.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And the projection for 1974 that you have given to us is a total of about 30,000 young people in the Federal operation, and roughly another 11,000 in the State.

Mr. LAKE. Sir, that was an identification of our identified capability, but our projection for 1974 is in connection with the $10 million appropriation.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Is that what the 1974 appropriation figure is at the present time, $10 million?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. How much is in the Interior budget and how much is in the Agriculture budget?

Mr. LAKE. Half and half.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And the figure which is actually not only in the budget but in the appropriation bill at the moment is $5 million apiece?

Mr. LAKE. Yes; a total of $10 million is appropriated.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Just to be clear, you are not talking budget, you are talking appropriation bills as they go through the process.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You expect, then, $10 million in 1974. Can you give me the comparable figures in number of camps and in number of participants for that $10 million?

Mr. LAKE. Yes. Now 30 percent of this for the first time will go to State operated programs.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Right.

Mr. LAKE. The 70 percent is for the Federal program. We believe we will involve about 6,500 youth in the Federal program in 172 camps. The remaining youth will be in State projects and we expect that with State participation we will have about 10,000 youth in total involved in the $10 million program.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So you expect about 3,500 participants in the State program?

Mr. LAKE. Roughly, yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. How many different programs or projects do you anticipate in the State program?

Mr. LAKE. I think roughly 35 youth per camp, therefore, roughly 100 projects. It will vary, I believe, from 35 to 50 or so.

Mr. DELLENBACK. These are the statistics that you actually project in terms of the present appropriation bill?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. There is not really much at this stage of the game we are going to be able to do to make more dollars available for fiscal 1974 unless, of course, we went to a supplemental appropriation. But shy the supplemental, these appropriation figures control what is actually going to happen in 1974?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, which coincides with the summer of 1974, it is a carryover.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Looking at these figures as one who starts out predisposed very much to say let's walk before we run, let's try something on a pilot basis before we shoot for the Moon. I am not impressed by the growth that has taken place between fiscal 1971 and fiscal 1974. Between fiscal 1972 and fiscal 1973, we were absolutely static in dollars, and we were almost static in numbers of participants. Why? Why didn't the program grow since the process was anticipated to be an evolutionary process? Specifically, why didn't it grow between 1972 and 1973?

Mr. LAKE. The act which authorizes the pilot program had $3.5 million.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And, therefore, you were not able to expand until we passed the bill which extended it for 1 year?

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman yield.

The administration came in and testified adversely to the $3.5 million, they didn't even want that.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Well, help me out as we reconstruct this because that was not our staff's recollection of what happened with the extension to fiscal 1974. The extension in fiscal 1974 was merely a 1 year's extension of what was already a law, and the initial law provided in fiscal 1973 for a $60 million authorization. I am not talking appropriations, I am talking about authorizations, and what the Congress did with this program was to take what was initially a 3-year program and simply extend it for 1 year at the same authorization level. Now, am I correct in this?

Mr. LAKE. The bill signed into law in October 1972, did authorize $30 million in fiscal year 1973, and $60 million in fiscal year 1974. However, no funds were appropriated under that law in fiscal year 1973.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Let's put the burden where it belongs.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You are saying now that the authorization level was $30 million for fiscal 1973 and that it was in the law. Now, let's walk through the process of getting the dollars but am I correct that the authorization was at this higher figure?

Mr. LAKE. As of October 1972, yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Then in October of 1972 you had not finished handing to the Congress the budget for 1974, but we were actually working on the budget and the appropriation for 1973 at that time.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So what you are saying to us is even though we increased the authorization for fiscal 1973, the budget and the appropriation process had progressed so far along that you are not able to expand it?

Mr. LAKE. Yes. As I recall, the appropriation hearings had already been conducted on the basis of the third and final year of the 3-year pilot program, that is $3.5 million, and the funds were appropriated on that basis, and a supplemental request for additional appropriation after the passage of the amended act was not initiated.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Then take me back through the history of it again. What you are saying to us is that the initial law we passed prior to 1971 was a 3-year authorization and the authorization limits in the initial bill were for $2.5 million during fiscal 1972.

Mr. LAKE. $3.5 million; and then in October 1972, the Congress modified the law.

Mr. DELLENBACK. At that time Congress increased the authorization for fiscal 1973 to $30 million, and the authorization for fiscal 1974 to $60 million.

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thus, at the time the budget was being prepared for fiscal 1973 the total authorization for this program was $3.5 million, and you made a request for the full $3.5 million?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. At the time we held appropriation hearings on that budget, we had not yet passed the expansion of the authorization to $30 million and $60 million respectively.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So that explains why you did not attempt a significant jump between 1972 and 1973.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. All right. Now we are facing a situation where the authorization for fiscal 1974 is $60 million, and given this situation you made a budget request of $10 million. Did the Congress cut your budget request, or was $10 million the total amount of the budget request? In other words, was $10 million your total request for fiscal 1974, and did Congress subsequently move to appropriate the full requested amount?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Did you seriously consider at that stage of the game—and I am not seeking to tear the veil of executive secrecy too much—did you seriously consider making a request for more than $10 million in fiscal 1974? You indicated that you had projected plans to handle more than the $10 million; indeed, you gave us indications that you projected a capacity to handle up to $43 million in expenditures.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Yes, Congressman. In a planning made, it was considered. However, we don't feel the identification of the capability necessary means that this is what we could request for fiscal 1974, or 1975 for that matter; it has to be prepared in step with the other programs in the Department.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We understand your concern. However, this is the type of balancing off of priorities which is ultimately the responsibility of the Congress. The budget request is a recommendation to the Congress as to how dollars should be spent. If we have appropriated a larger amount, we would expect that it would be spent, not locked up in the Treasury at any stage of the game. If we appropriate, we do not expect this to be impounded. I am pleased in this program, to date, that there has been no impoundment. Since the budget request is for $10 million, and we have not appropriated beyond it, I would expect that there would be again no impounding for fiscal 1974.

As far as the State grants are concerned in fiscal 1974, you indicate that you worked under the present law. I notice in looking at Public Law 92-597—which is the law—the language of section 4(c) reads, "The amount of any grant shall be determined jointly by the secretaries except that no grant for any project may exceed 80 percent of the cost of such project." Consequently, you are not in a situation where we have mandated that the Federal portion be 50 percent, or 30 percent, or anything else; we have given you discretion in this particular regard and you have proceeded to exercise that discretion.

How many applications have you had from States thus far for the approximately $3 million you are going to be able to use, assuming we make that appropriation?

Mr. AKER. I can answer that. We have not received any formal application to date. The way that we are setting up the grant programs we each have representatives in each State that work with the Governor's designee in that particular State for the grant projects. All 50 States have indicated an interest in the program. However, through their legislative process some of them may not be able to participate in the first year, but all of them say that they will.

The proposals will be made with our people on the ground, plus the State people, and it will be approved there and then sent to a service

center for processing. We have put the State grant money in one service center. We will administer the program jointly and the money will be scheduled to the States in accordance with their desires.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Do you intend to be certain that every State expressing interest gets some funds?

Mr. AKER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. If the State indicates its inability to operate a 50-percent grant, what will you do under those circumstances?

Mr. AKER. Well, we will just have to reprogram those funds or make a new determination as to what the matching grants will be.

Mr. DELLENBACK. In other words, your controlling criteria will not be that every State gets some money; your controlling criteria will be a 50 percent sharing factor.

Mr. AKER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Under present plans, then, all allocations will be done on a 50–50 sharing basis. Any State that will share 50–50 will be in a position where it gets some of the funds. If a State will not share 50–50, you will divert the funds that would have gone to that State and, instead, make them available to another State which will match 50-50.

Mr. AKER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. The Chair will split the remaining 20 minutes with the gentleman from Oregon. We want to finish this panel at 11 so we can get the other panel.

The Chair has an additional question.

Now just to follow that up then, contrary to what I understood you to say a little while ago, the sole criterion is 50–50 sharing.

Mr. LAKE. No.

Mr. AKER. It is not the sole criterion, but it is the one that we are trying to go by at the present time.

Mr. MEEDS. It is one of the absolute criteria then. In other words, if a State will not make 50–50 matching, you presently do not intend to fund that program, is that correct?

Mr. LAKE. I don't believe we can make a decision on that until we actually see the application, compare it to other applications and then decide whether to seek a waiver of that guideline. It is stated in terms of preference. Preference will be given to States who are willing to match 50–50. I think we will have to cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. MEEDS. Well, I certainly hope as the author of this legislation in the House that you do not attempt to impose that as an absolute criterion because that certainly was not this Member's intention. Now it may well be that you will like to use it as one of the criteria, but the other things are more important. Where are the lands, where are the needs of the children and the needs of the land? That is what this bill was all about.

Mr. LAKE. I might add, sir, that the formula that we worked out in terms of funds that each State could apply for were based on the criteria you just mentioned—the population, where the lands are, what the needs are. Then, in addition to that, the quality of the proposals will be considered in reaching a decision.

Mr. MEEDS. Sir, let me just very quickly get over some other things.

Last year we calculated there was about a 75-percent return—that is to say, that the young people, the return on their work was 75 per-

cent of the entire cost of the program. Is that running about the same this year to your knowledge?

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Well, in the second year the value of the work amounted to about $2.7 million, which represents about a 79-percent return, Mr. Chairman. We don't have the final figures for 1973 as yet, but we expect the work value to be equal to 1972.

Mr. MEEDS. The first year as I recall was approximately 70 percent, so then it increased at least in the second year to almost 10 percent.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. This does not count their salaries, this is just what they are putting back in terms of value to the citizens of this country in the enhancement of their outdoor environment and quality of their environment.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. My recollection was that the selection process was rather—if you will permit the expression—helter-skelter the first year, and that some criteria were adopted the second year which I think had the tendency to make it a little more certain. Could you just go through that very quickly, what was done in the third year now in terms of selection process?

Mr. AKER. Well, in the selection process we tried to expand the areas of recruitment so that the more children would have an opportunity to participate in the program. Then in many of the States we have statewide recruitment for projects within that State. Our projection for 1974 is that we are going to try to go in all 50 States on a statewide basis. This will eliminate some of our 5-day camps that we have had where the recruit comes from the local communities so that every youngster within that State is going to have an opportunity to get into the program on an equal basis with everybody else in those age groups.

Mr. MEEDS. Now with regard to their income levels and race and other things like that, again the purpose of the act was to provide a mix. This is not just for poor kids. It is not just for rich kids. It is not for just white kids, or black kids, or Indians, or Mexican Americans. It is for all kids. To provide some kind of a mix which will help all of the young people by making the strengths and weaknesses of all of them available to the others, if that is not putting it too broadly.

Mr. AKER. We hold very close to those criteria, sir, to be sure that in each camp we have had almost 10 to 1 applicants for the number of slots that we have had in camps. So in our selection process we make sure that we do get the mix that is required by the law, and it represents the populations within the States and so forth.

Mr. MEEDS. What kind of backup do you have now? Is it total Secretarial discretion? That is to say, if a program is submitted by the local educational agency as so many are, and you don't find the correct mix or it does not represent a correct mix, you have authority to just simply reduce the grant on that basis?

Mr. AKER. Yes, we do that.

Mr. MEEDS. You know, we found the first year in some areas that all the teachers' kids were in the program and not very many other people. That type of thing I assume is being corrected.

Mr. AKER. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. One final question. How about the cooperation from the armed services and other agencies of the Government?

Mr. AKER. It has been very good, sir. As you know, in an 8-week program we cannot become property owners, so we lean very heavily on the military to provide us with some vehicles, which is the thing that we really need. Also GSA has been outstanding in their cooperation with us providing us with low rental vehicles for the summer months.

Mr. MEEDS. A story I get from the programs in my State is that Fort Lewis and Fort Lawton have been extremely helpful (1) in providing cooks, (2) in providing clerks, (3) in providing transportation, including back country helicopter lift and support, and that they have just bent over backward to help. Now is this the story generally, or is it that rosy? Could we strengthen the bill to make sure that is it?

Mr. AKER. The military support that we received it is not really universal because the orders that went out were to assist the YCC as much as possible, but it could not deter their primary mission which, of course, is the defense of the United States. So it was up to the local commanders of the post involved really as to how much support we received in those local areas. However, in some cases where the local commander did not provide some support, then the National Guard in many of the States has assisted us.

In Maine the National Guard unit set up the tent camps, built the latrines and so forth for the camps, on the game refuge. So we are appreciative of the support that they have given.

Mr. MEEDS. Maybe the committee ought to have people from the Armed Forces over to testify to see how this could be improved because the program in Washington State, the effectiveness of the program was enhanced at least threefold by the cooperation of the armed services in that State.

One final shot here. Gentlemen, I just can't resist this in view of your statement, particularly Mr. Hite, on page 3 where you talk about severe fiscal restraints and inflationary pressure of the economy together with limited financial resources, et cetera, et cetera. You know, it is really ironic that you talk about Catoctin. Round Meadows Conservation Corps is located hardly a stone's throw from Camp David, Md., where I understand the increase in cost has been about six times since 1968.

Now what would you do if you could just increase the capability of the Catoctin, Md. camp six times? Think about it a little in thinking about priorities when you talk about fiscal responsibility and fiscal restraints and all those things. I know it is little. I don't mean to be picayune, but it is an example of this administration talking out of both sides of its mouth.

Mr. HITE. I understand your point, Mr. Chairman. I was addressing there, as I know you understand, the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

Mr. MEEDS. The restraints you are talking about are by the Office of the Manager of the Budget.

Thank you, gentlemen.

The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am intrigued by the mathematics of the chairman. On a comparable mathematical projection, the increase in this

program since 1968 has been infinite. In 1968, this program didn't exist and what you have done is move forward from zero to $10 million. Thus, on a purely mathematical basis, we are looking at a program which has expanded infinitely greater than any other expenditure. However, that is just a side comment as the chairman's comment was a side comment.

May I ask about the 1975 projections, gentlemen? Since the budget is almost done—and we again don't ask you to tear veils of secrecy asunder—what are you actually going to project beyond 1974? Can you give us comparable figures similar to what you gave us earlier on number of camps, number of participants, and dollars for the 1975 budgetary projection.

Mr. HITE. We are just in the process of submitting our figures, laying the program alternatives consideration for the 1975 budget. I am sure I don't want to speak for Mr. Vander Myde who actually submits the appropriations.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Are you able to give us an approximate projection of what you would have the capacity to handle in 1975? I recognize there might be a scaling down from these projections.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Again, Mr. Dellenback, I believe we come back to the level that we previously discussed. Certainly we make every effort within both departments to meet the mandates of Congress at whatever level of funding is authorized for the YCC program. However, we certainly do have studies and evaluations on which we have made these identifications of expansion capability.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Are you then indicating, using the prior figures which you gave to us, that you would project your outside feasible capacity to be about $43 million?

Mr. VANDER MYDE. That is the identification.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And that is your maximum identification for fiscal 1975?

It would be a capacity of about 30,000 young people in the Federal operations, and about 10,000 to 12,000 young people in the State operations, is that correct?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Do you have an estimate of the number of camps involved in that projection?

Mr. LAKE. Oh, yes; 550 Federal.

Mr. DELLENBACK. 550.

Mr. LAKE. Federal.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Again using the projection you used before of 35 to 1, you then have roughly 300 State camps, something like that.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So you do have a projection for growth, although I recognize that you won't have the final voice in what the budget request will be. Of course, you don't have the final voice on the appropriation either. Thus, moving from 1973 to 1975: In 1973 you projected 3,500 young people; in 1974 you are projecting 10,000 young people, and in 1975 you would project 42,000 young people. That is the growth, in these beginning years, that you are capable of handling.

Mr. VANDER MYDE. That is right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And you are also capable of handling the same type of growth in camps and in dollars?

Mr. VANDER MYDE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am, like the chairman, very much inclined to feel that the function of these camps, and the involvement of these young people, is a very sound idea. I think that much good has been accomplished. I have walked across bridges they've built, and I have walked down trails they've completed just this summer, so I have seen the real value of their efforts.

I, too, am concerned about moving forward in an orderly way, but I don't want you to dibble along the way. I want it to be as hard as you can realistically press forward. Therefore, I hope that you will carry back to your meetings within your departments—and your meetings with OMB—the strong feeling of the Congress that since you have this kind of projected capacity, that you really come very close to meeting it. You have given us the figures—you volunteered them—and if we find in the budgetary request instead of there being a request for $43 million in this particular regard, there is a budgetary request that is essentially close to the $10 million, we will know it is not because you don't have the capacity to handle it.

I am not in any wise berating you gentlemen. I am just trying to give you ammunition to carry into your own arguments. The Congress, I think, is becoming more and more sold on this particular program, and is going not to be put off by the argument that you can't do it. You have indicated you can make a fourfold increase between 1974 and 1975. You have the capacity to do it without sacrificing quality, which is something that will be very important to us.

May I, however, step beyond that because I am concerned about this statement of the twentyfold increase. What would happen if we mandated for you a twentyfold increase?

Mr. MEEDS. In 1 year?

Mr. DELLENBACK. Yes. What would happen in the actual operation of the program if we said "thou shalt," and then we appropriated the dollars and gave you the appropriation to "shalt."

Mr. LAKE. Twentyfold?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am borrowing the chairman's comment. What would happen if we said to you, "Look, you have the capacity to move to 10,000 in fiscal 1974." Or, on the other hand, what if we told you to move to 75,000, which would be closer to a twentyfold increase over 3,500.

Mr. LAKE. One significant impact would be the detail of our regular personnel for 2 months or more to work with the temporary personnel we hire in staffing the camps and their diversion away from the other types of regular work. We estimate that there will be about 5,000 of our regular work force diverted this way under a $150 million program, so that would be very significant.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So many of us who have had temporary personnel—and we all have intern programs on the Hill—know that you don't just bring them in and say, take off. Instead, you detail your own staff to working with them. So one thing that would happen would be a drastic decrease in the amount of other work that would be able to be done.

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Are there other things?

Mr. LAKE. Another thing would be simply the problem concerned with lining up the facilities for residential camps. Now we can quite often use temporary facilities, tent camps, but you still need sewage

facilities and messing facilities, so this would be one of the real difficulties we would encounter.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You don't see either of those difficulties in the projections for 1975. You can make the fourfold increase from 1974 to 1975 without overly draining other staff capacity and without running into the fiscal problem that you talk about. You can go not only to the 10,000 in 1974 but you can go to 40,000 in 1975 without running into those difficulties.

Mr. LAKE. Yes, sir. Part of that survey was to consider and actually identify the facilities or opportunity to put up temporary facilities, so this enters into that projection.

Mr. DELLENBACK. But you think to go beyond that would be a sacrifice of something else along the way?

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Remember what you told us about a fourfold increase in 1975.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. HITE. Thank you.

Mr. MEEDS. We recognize the restraints you are under, and we certainly commend you for the operation of this program. You have done a very good job.

Mr. HITE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAKE. Thank you.

Mr. MEEDS. We actually have four more witnesses and I would like them in two panels. First of all, camp directors or program directors. We have Miss Sue Knott and Mr. James Schafer. Would you like to come forward, please.

Let the Chair suggest a question here. We also have two program participants. Would the participants feel at ease on a panel with the directors or would the participants rather testify by themselves? It does not make any difference to the Chair.

Why don't you come forward then, too.

We have Mr. Jeff Sager who participated in a program and Miss Sue Moser.

We have 1 hour. The Chair would like to reserve for himself and the gentleman from Oregon one-half of that time to ask questions.

Please proceed in any fashion you wish. Just identify yourselves. I think probably we should start with you, Sue.

STATEMENT OF SUE KNOTT, YCC PROGRAM DIRECTOR

Miss KNOTT. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, I appear before you to urge the passage of H.R. 8433, the bill to expand and make permanent the Youth Conservation Corps. I wholeheartedly support the concept of the YCC; therefore, advocating that it be made permanent and expand so that more of our Nation's youth may participate. This experience with youth has proven to be the most rewarding of my career. I have seen young people from many different socioeconomic levels, ethnic groups, and abilities work side by side to achieve a common goal. They have exhibited creativity, leadership, a willingness to work and pride in their accomplishments.

The merits of this program, Mr. Chairman, are clearly evident so that I will not spend more time enumerating them. I would prefer, if I may, to express some thoughts on the future of the Youth Conservation Corps. These thoughts represent the thinking of the staff and enrollees at Harpers Ferry Youth Conservation Corps Camp.

First, experimentation and innovation must be a continuing feature of the YCC so that it will not become another fixed structure of the bureaucratic system. These young people are filled with imagination and creativity. The program should remain flexible enough to tap these valuable resources.

Furthermore, the YCC should be a year-round program employing a work-study situation with the local school systems. Many of the projects begun during the YCC summer season could be continued through the year on a reduced scale but brought to a more complete end. We at Harpers Ferry have entered into a cooperative agreement with the Jefferson County School Board and have received their full support with this program. The superintendent of schools, Harold Pickens, has expressed his approval with the program. In a recent letter to select Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Mr. Pickens extolled the virtues of the YCC:

> I have viewed with a great amount of pride the actual work being done by these young people in the restoration and upgrading of historical sites. At the same time, I am also acutely aware of the tremendous social value of this program as it affects the lives of not only the corpsmen, but the many, many tourists who visit these spots annually. These young people come from different families with varied socio-economic backgrounds; yet, they have developed a very close relationship with one another.

With this kind of support I believe it possible to convince the local school board that a year-round work-study program with credit could be implemented to the satisfaction of the educational systems and the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the expansion of the YCC program can be unlimited. I recommend that a national YCC exchange program be implemented so that not only youths of different socioeconomic and racial groups be exposed to each other but that youths from different areas of the United States be made more aware of regional problems and differences.

And finally to illustrate the boundless opportunities afforded by the YCC we at Harpers Ferry urge and encourage an international YCC exchange program. Mr. Chairman, members of this committee have a unique opportunity to improve upon the bill as passed by the U.S. Senate by amending it to make provision for the establishment of an international type YCC with those countries willing to undertake such an endeavor. It is the belief of the enrollees that the conservation ethic should be a worldwide commitment and that the United States should initiate such a move. Mr. Chairman, it is in the hands of you and your committee.

I thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express my support for and thoughts on the future of the Youth Conservation Corps.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you very much, Sue.

We will go ahead and listen to all of you and then come back to our questions.

Please proceed if you would, Mr. Schafer.

STATEMENT OF JAMES W. SCHAFER, YCC PROGRAM DIRECTOR

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the YCC organization allows staff the opportunity to test educational hypotheses and theories not always possible in the classroom which is often confined by physical or staff restrictions. In this way its feedback to school districts can have paramount import.

The program developed by the YCC staff allows Corps members the benefits of the ideas of a specialized and idealistic staff, presenting the Corps with America in microcosm in a manageable and close knit context, one in which the Corps can develop a sense of belonging by having a voice in determining the values, purpose and structure of their community.

In all, the accomplishment of YCC objectives allowed staff and Corps personal and professional development to carry back to their schools. There is no contest as to whether social, work habits, and skills, and environmental education growth occur—the reports of the University of Michigan statistically measures the growth. The growth is carried to more than the local school—as people grow their associates also grow; by becoming active the nature of the universe takes on a different meaning and the result is a more compelling force to improve personal relationships and the order of things. In this way a reservoir of talented people is constructed which speaks well for the future of the United States.

In formulating the operation staff set out to create a program emphasizing human relationships, since environmental education is the educational process dealing with man's relationship with his natural and manmade surroundings. For the camp experience to meet YCC objectives, three major areas of development are pinpointed: social, environmental education, and work skills, and attitudes. Underlying these general areas are the demands to create opportunities and experiences for the youth to acquire increased self-dignity and self-discipline work better with and relate to peers and supervisors; build lasting cultural and communication bridges between youth from various social, economic, and racial backgrounds.

The camp becomes a place where responsibility and accountability are placed on each individual. Staff develop general guidelines in programs—work-learning projects, labs, environmental field studies, recreation, evening electives, swimming instruction, social activities and a camp lifestyle plan. The corpsmembers determine their own leadership structure and they, along with the staff, outline a program agreeable to both their interests and departmental directives.

Does the formula work? Three years with YCC compels me to answer affirmatively.

There is a movement within our local school district toward 12-month education—it has investigated our operation toward that end and has granted our camp participants one social studies credit equal to 1 year of school.

Let me close by reading to you a few of the remarks made by our Corps about their summer experience.

I had a really nice time in camp and I hope that I will be able to come back some day for YCC.

Very interesting and profitable way to spend the summer if you like to work hard.

I really had a great time at camp. It was educational as well as fun. It gave me a chance to meet new people and make lasting friendships. It taught me how to accept responsibility, leadership, take criticism and have more respect for myself and others. Camp has changed a lot of my morals and ideas on life and gave me a new outlook. It gave me a chance to grow up and brought me closer to my family.

As a whole I really enjoyed staying here and working here. This is an experience I'll never forget. Personally, I would recommend it to any teenager. It gave me a completely different outlook on life in more ways than one.

Just a thank you for including me in the YCC program. It's done more for me than all my other 17 years.

To all staff members: This is the best time I've had in my entire life. I have learned a lot about ecology and about people and life. I've learned how to get along with most people . . . and how to treat them. I'll never forget the times, the people, the places we went. Thanks for what this camp has done for me and thanks for making this camp the greatest place a kid could want to be.

I have learned that prejudice is neither good nor necessary. I have learned how to live with others and look out for their needs as well as my own. I realize, now, that other people have opinions, too, and I should respect these. I've learned about working as a team, how to work together, and how to use tools properly. I've learned to eat what I get and that complaining does nothing but bring you and everyone else down. I've learned how to gain 10 whole pounds and develop muscles.

This is a girl.

I've learned about the environment, the wastefulness that goes on within our environment, and what to do about it. I've really gained a lot through close relationships with the adults. I understand how they feel about things. Through trying to help others, I feel I've really helped myself because you realize how they must feel. Now I really have hope for my future and confidence only YCC could give me. I could name a hundred ways it has helped me but it is without a doubt the best thing that ever happened to me and 39 others.

I cannot begin to list all that I've learned and experienced this summer in YCC.

I agree with Sue that the program has proved a success and any movement toward expansion would be in the best interests of the youth of this age group as well as the United States.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you very much, Jim.

Let's hear next from you, Sue, if we may.

STATEMENT OF SUE MOSER, PROGRAM PARTICIPANT

Miss MOSER. Mr. Chairman, one of the objectives of the Youth Conservation Corps is to learn about the natural environment, including the natural resources. This is accomplished through the activities which everyone is involved in. To learn about the meaningful use, management, and protection of the natural resources is another objective. This knowledge was also gained through the various activities associated with the YCC camps.

Those activities include the election of members to the forum and its committees: Recreation, education, physical plant and dining committees. The purpose of these committees is to present proposals to forum for the benefit of camp and corpsmembers. Each committee is headed by a forum member and are guided by camp advisers. Other activities associated with the forum and its committees are the invitational sports tournament held by the recreation committee and the public programs such as the YCC symposium and the Baltimore program along with several rap sessions which were held by the education committee.

To be gainfully employed in outdoor activities directly relating to the use, management, and protection of the natural resources is another objective relating to the activity known as work. Corpsmembers also participated in this aspect of the camp to accomplish needed conservation work which improves, maintains and/or enhances more of the natural resources. The work projects ranged from safety trimming to building an Adirondack shelter to restoring the Sawmill Tailrace. After the work part of the day was over we prepared for our next activity which follows dinner. They are swimming or environmental labs depending what group you are in. The purpose of the swimming instruction is to further our ability. During the lab the corpsmembers learned to use chemical test kits so that they would be able to analyze the abuse done to the land and water and how it affects man. Other activities included evening electives where corpsmembers selected whatever course they were interested in. The courses included manual communications, arts and crafts, ecology, and photography.

Trips were many and very worthwhile. They included western Maryland, central Maryland, Baltimore and Chincoteague. During these trips corpsmembers spent time and energy exploring the educational aspects of each trip, with the chemical test kits, lectures, and slide presentations. Corpsmembers also had time on these trips to swim, canoe, hike, and to enjoy cookouts.

Activities such as these enabled corpsmembers to acquire increased self-dignity and self-discipline, to work better with and relate to peers and supervisors, and finally to build lasting cultural and communication bridges between youth from various social, ethnic, racial, and economic backgrounds.

To me camp means doing and participating in a job that I feel proud of, so that after the end of camp I can look back and see that what I enjoyed doing someone else is enjoying the sight of it as they visit the park. It feels great to know that you as an individual can construct something with your own hands that benefits man and does not harm the environment.

Thank you.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Sue.

Jeff.

STATEMENT OF JEFF SAGER, PROGRAM PARTICIPANT

Mr. SAGER. Gentlemen, in the 2 years that I have been associated with the YCC I have gained a lifetime of knowledge in such matters as ecology, public service, public relations, and community welfare.

I went into the YCC not exactly sure of what ecological problems meant to me, but when I went through our rap sessions where we talk about problems and then go out and do something about them, I learned what it takes to clean up our Earth and just what I could do to help.

In the Harpers Ferry National Park, with which I am associated, the rangers have a tremendous workload. But with the help of the YCC in such matters as metal preservation, painting, and beautification the YCC can prove to be invaluable.

While working with people in the YCC I have gained several lasting friendships that go beyond the limits of a 9 to 5 workday. On several

occasions when the only way a catastrophe could be averted would be for the YCC to work overtime, we gladly struggled through 3 feet of mud to save the lives of some 40 fish. Once again it was the YCC to the rescue.

As my career as an enrollee is almost over, I hope for the future of the YCC to include a year-round program with credit given in the high schools and work-study credit in college. I would also hope that there could be an international YCC program where enrollees could be exchanged and learn other methods to have ecology minded people the world over.

Thank you.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Jeff.

Sue Knott, I would like to start with you and explore your concept of a year-round program. Could you allay my fear that YCC is such a good program, it is so popular with young people I have talked to, that it might be considered to be an inducement to get out of school?

Miss KNOTT. Yes, sir. I think it would be a complement rather than inducement to get out of school. There are required courses that students might take and then, say, work in the afternoon. Our school begins at 7:30 in the morning; then work at required courses and in the park for the afternoons and weekends. I think it might dovetail some of the actual classroom classes.

Mr. MEEDS. In other words, it would be like an inschool Neighborhood Youth Corps program. That is a very interesting concept.

Miss Knott, how were you selected to be a camp director or program director?

Miss KNOTT. By the Jefferson County School Board who was responsible for getting personnel.

Mr. MEEDS. You were in education?

Miss KNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. What do you teach?

Miss KNOTT. Social studies.

Mr. MEEDS. Is this your first year with YCC?

Miss KNOTT. Third year.

Mr. MEEDS. The concept of sending youth from other areas may take children from Florida and send them to the west coast under your concept?

Miss KNOTT. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. Now you know we have our detractors in the House of Representatives particularly who like to make a big ado over how much it cost to transport young people from place to place and I have even heard some people maintain we always send them first class in aircraft across the country. Don't you think we would be subject to some criticism with that kind of program?

Miss KNOTT. Maybe, but don't you have military transportation? That is a possibility.

Mr. MEEDS. I had not thought of that. That is a possibility. It would give the military an opportunity for training.

Miss KNOTT. Yes, sir, it sure would.

Mr. MEEDS. In some instances it perhaps might fit into their program.

If we got criticized for a regional exchange program, just think what the Congress would say about an international exchange program. Wow. You think that would still be good?

Miss KNOTT. Yes, sir. I think the United States should take the initiative.

Mr. MEEDS. Had it ever occurred to you that we might use counterpart funds in that kind of program, money which is available in foreign countries for expenditures there, moneys which are owed the United States?

Miss KNOTT. I had not thought of that.

Mr. MEEDS. Certainly it might be worth looking into.

Miss KNOTT. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Schafer, what was the selection process used to bring the young people to the Brown Meadow camp?

Mr. SCHAFER. We work very closely with the local school district.

Mr. MEEDS. One school district?

Mr. SCHAFER. This year we went into two, Frederick County and Baltimore City. In Frederick County we send literature out to the schools through guidance counselors and give them instructions and they in turn send the applications back to us.

Baltimore City is a little bit different. We had 40 slots in camp. We reserved 10, 25 percent of the camps, for Baltimore City. Their concern was that mass publicity would bring a deluge of applications so they handled it as best as they saw fit and submitted to us 20 of their top candidates who they felt were top and then we interviewed all applicants to reach our number.

Mr. MEEDS. Did you have any idea why they considered them top candidates?

Mr. SCHAFER. We gave them, as we do in Frederick County, characteristics which we found to be very successful.

Mr. MEEDS. Will you tell us about those characteristics, please?

Is it all right if we call these selection criteria?

Mr. SCHAFER. Fine.

Independence, ability to work without supervision, interest in conservation, a sense of humor, empathy, ability to get along with others, and adaptability.

Mr. MEEDS. That is kind of the cream of the crop, isn't it?

Gee, if my kids were that good I would feel very proud.

Mr. SCHAFER. They go through a rating process, each school does, simply assigning a number like five for the highest, one for the lowest.

Mr. MEEDS. Well, don't we want some ones in this program?

Mr. SCHAFER. Right. We make efforts to tag or to make sure that we have a good cross section.

Mr. MEEDS. Well, when you say "we," what do you mean "we"?

Mr. SCHAFER. Those of us that make the final selections. In our camp it is myself, the assistant director of our project manager, and a representative from the board of education.

Mr. MEEDS. Are you in fact looking for that socioeconomic, ethnic, racial mix that we talked about in this bill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir. Of our corpsmembers last year, 50 percent—it might be a little greater, let's say 50 percent—came from families with incomes below $8,000.

Mr. MEEDS. How many of them came from families of incomes below $4,000?

Mr. SCHAFER. Twenty-five percent. Frederick County is very scarce in terms of minorities but 25 percent of our camp positions were by minorities.

Mr. MEEDS. Any other breakdowns that you can give us?

Mr. SCHAFER. Not that I know of.

Mr. MEEDS. In other words, 25 percent of 40.

Mr. SCHAFER. Right. There are some high schools in that county system that have no minorities.

Mr. MEEDS. What percent of them came from families with income over $15,000?

Mr. SCHAFER. I think 11 percent.

Mr. MEEDS. Any with incomes over $25,000?

Mr. SCHAFER. That category was not included on the application form this year so the top as I recall was $15,000.

Mr. MEEDS. Really? That is kind of discriminating against wealth, isn't it?

Mr. SCHAFER. $15,000 and over.

Mr. MEEDS. Oh, $15,000 and over.

Mr. SCHAFER. That is the category.

Mr. MEEDS. I see.

Now how long have you been in the program?

Mr. SCHAFER. Three years.

Mr. MEEDS. How were you selected initially?

Mr. SCHAFER. By the project manager.

Mr. MEEDS. Are you also in education?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. What is your field?

Mr. SCHAFER. Social studies.

Mr. MEEDS. Where?

Mr. SCHAFER. Frederick County.

Mr. MEEDS. Your concept of school credits, Mr. Schafer, was this somewhat like Miss Knott was talking about, perhaps an on-going year-round program in which it worked part of the day and went to their own school part of the day, or would that work around there?

Mr. SCHAFER. It is pretty secluded. The county is looking very seriously at 12-month education. To be constrained in a classroom for 12 months would probably drive students as well as the teachers batty. An outdoor education program with more to it than simply looking and watching and viewing and getting in to work, social experience, this is what the county is working toward. They are looking at our camp particularly. They have expressed interest in the construction of their own camp for outdoor education using a program like the YCC to construct it. Just like any other course, this block time if successfully completed by a participant would receive normal school credit as they already grant to us at this time.

Mr. MEEDS. Miss Moser, how were you selected? How did you learn about YCC? How did you apply in it?

Miss MOSER. Well, I had friends who were in YCC last year and they told me how much fun it was and I went to the office and got the material on it and saw some teachers.

Mr. MEEDS. Where do you go to school?

Miss MOSER. Catoctin High.

Mr. MEEDS. Where is that?

Miss MOSER. Thurmond, Md.

Mr. MEEDS. How big a city is that?

Miss MOSER. 3,000.

Mr. MEEDS. How many of your classmates were in the Brown Meadow program?

Miss MOSER. This year there were five.

Mr. MEEDS. Five of the 40 came from a city of 3,000?

Miss MOSER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Wouldn't you say that is a little disproportionate? Baltimore had 8, 10.

No?

Miss MOSER. I guess.

Mr. MEEDS. Maybe the concept of the State has, or they will have, a new criteria. The statewide selection this year is a good idea.

Tell me what kinds of jobs you were involved in, Sue.

Miss MOSER. Well, for the first 4 weeks I was on the Adirondack Shelter and the second 4 weeks I was on safety trimming.

Mr. MEEDS. Tell us what safety trimming is.

Miss MOSER. Well, it is where you go and you clear the hazardous lands that block the view.

Mr. MEEDS. On trails?

Miss MOSER. Yes, and roads.

Mr. MEEDS. Tell us about the Adirondack Shelter. Where is it and what did you do?

Miss MOSER. It is very secluded. It is up Raven Rock Road and it was for horseback riders and hikers.

Mr. MEEDS. It is a shelter where people stay overnight, is it not?

Miss MOSER. Yes, and we had a spring, latrine, and hitching post.

Mr. MEEDS. How did you get your materials in there?

Miss MOSER. One and a quarter ton trucks.

Mr. MEEDS. Did you use some of the natural materials, too; logs?

Miss MOSER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Now you are not the biggest young lady I have seen. How much do you weigh? [Laughter.]

Mr. DELLENBACK. You never ask a girl that.

Miss MOSER. The last time I checked it was 117.

Mr. MEEDS. 117 dripping wet.

Were you involved in heavy lifting and things like that?

Miss MOSER. Some.

Mr. MEEDS. Gee, wasn't that harmful to your health?

Miss MOSER. Well, I come from the country so I am sort of used to it.

Mr. MEEDS. What I am trying to find out here, you didn't think you were put upon because you had to do a little heavy manual labor, did you?

Miss MOSER. No.

Mr. MEEDS. It didn't hurt you a bit, did it?

Miss MOSER. No.

Mr. MEEDS. You were just as good as those guys, weren't you?

Miss MOSER. Yes, and better in some cases.

Mr. MEEDS. All right, Sue.

Jeff, where is your school?

Mr. SAGER. Right now I am a freshman at Shepherd College.

Mr. MEEDS. What was your high school?

Mr. SAGER. Shepherdstown and then they consolidated into Jefferson.

Mr. MEEDS. How many students are in that high school?

Mr. SAGER. 305.

Mr. MEEDS. How close is it located to Harpers Ferry?

Mr. SAGER. About 7 miles.

Mr. MEEDS. How many of your classmates were in the Harpers Ferry program.

Mr. SAGER. The first two?

Mr. MEEDS. Well, the first year.

Mr. SAGER. I was in it 2 years.

Mr. MEEDS. You were a corpsman 2 years?

Mr. SAGER. Yes, sir, a corpsman the first year and leader the second.

Mr. MEEDS. You really scared me there. You know, there is a prohibition against more than 1 year as a corpsman.

In the first year you were a senior there in high school?

Mr. SAGER. Junior.

Mr. MEEDS. So you skipped a year and came back as a counselor?

Mr. SAGER. No, sir. My junior year I was a corpsmember, last year I was a youth leader.

Mr. MEEDS. Then this is your first year of college.

Mr. SAGER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. How many people were from the high school when you were a corpsmember?

Mr. SAGER. I think about seven.

Mr. MEEDS. Out of a 305 student body high school. How many were in the Harpers Ferry program altogether?

Mr. SAGER. Thirty.

Mr. MEEDS. Did you get an opportunity to mix with children or young people that you didn't ordinarily have an opportunity to mix with?

Mr. SAGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. How were some of these people different than people you ordinarily mix with?

Mr. SAGER. Race, religion. It didn't seem to bother me.

Mr. MEEDS. What is the best thing you think this Youth Conservation Corps did for you?

Mr. SAGER. Started in relation to the Park Service.

Mr. MEEDS. Are you considering now making that a career, Park Service?

Mr. SAGER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Incidentally, you would be happy to know that in talking with the forest rangers in my county they now consider the Youth Conservation Corps as the prime recruitment center for their future people, they really do. So you have gotten the same thing with the Park Service.

How do you think you may have helped the program? I have asked you how it helped you, now you tell us how you helped it.

Mr. SAGER. Well, every 2 weeks we get together with a rap session and if I have got some ideas that I think are going to make the program better I have got a chance to express them and then they are taken into consideration with the camp director and the project manager and then if there is something they think is valuable or worthwhile we discuss it.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate your giving me this opportunity. I must apologize—I have an 11:45 meeting that I must go to but I would like to ask a couple of questions before leaving.

Miss Knott, which was the administering agency for Harpers Ferry?

Miss KNOTT. National Park Service.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Was it the same for you?

Mr. SCHAFER. National Park Service.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Neither was the Forest Service?

Mr. SCHAFER. No, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You commented, Mr. Schafer, that the admission criteria or the final decisions were made by you and your assistant director. Who set the criteria basically?

Mr. SCHAFER. We did. We didn't see any point in using grades as a criteria. What we found was that certain characteristics over a 3-year period, certain criteria, lent themselves to a successful experience.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Did you set these criteria the first year? They gave you a certain number of slots and you filled the slots, is that correct?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Was the same thing done?

Miss KNOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. In neither instance did the Park Service attempt to set the criteria insofar as they are set by status as to age and a few simple things of this nature?

Miss KNOTT. The Park Service was very particular that we had a good representation. The project manager took a look at our enrollees and representation.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Geographic representation?

Miss KNOTT. Well, we are a nonresidential camp but, yes, there was geographical representation in that it represented all three high schools.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Lots of local discretion as to how you did it; it was not a case of being handed down?

Mr. SCHAFER. There are guidelines in the manual that you receive. There are guidelines, yes, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Did they work pretty well? Were they loose enough and yet tight enough so that you were able to get the help that you wanted and yet you were not hamstrung as to how you would make the selection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir. We were visited by OEO this summer about our composition, so there are checks.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am intrigued. Who was it that came to visit?

Mr. SCHAFER. I think it was the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I am intrigued by that particular involvement if indeed that was the case. We can follow that up. At least you had some visitors who were there to check with you on this particular thing.

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. How did you work out the utilization of the dollars that were made available to you? Did you have much flexibility as to how you would utilize your dollars? Were you told what you do with your money or were you given a certain amount and you had a chance to use it for this purpose or some other purpose?

Miss KNOTT. There was quite a bit of flexibility. Some limitations were set down.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Did they give you the budget that you had to use, or did they give you a certain amount and then you had certain flexibility as to how much you spent for food?

Miss KNOTT. We were given guidelines. So much spent on salaries, a certain percentage, and then over that we had pretty much flexibility to do what we wanted.

Mr. DELLENBACK. What about the utilization of the salary amounts? Were you given flexibility as to how much you use the youth counselors as well as how much you pay a youth counselor?

Miss KNOTT. That was up to the Department, not the counselor but the youth leaders and the enrollees. This is established, I think.

Mr. DELLENBACK. How much are youth leaders paid and how much are enrollees paid?

Miss KNOTT. Youth leaders are paid——

Mr. DELLENBACK. Aside from being too little.

Miss KNOTT. Youth leaders were $12.50 and enrollees I think is $10.50. This is for a nonresidential camp, it is a little less in——

Mr. DELLENBACK. $10.25.

Miss KNOTT. Per day.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Now, were those figures established for you?

Miss KNOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. And you had no discretion as to how you would use those?

Miss KNOTT. Right.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Was this also the case with you?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir, although ours were residential so they were given an 8-week salary figure which was $392 and $308, respectively.

Mr. DELLENBACK. For the leaders and the participants?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Over the 3 years did those amounts stay the same?

Mr. SCHAFER. They stayed the same but the FICA increased.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Ending up being a losing proposition?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Did you talk to them about increasing it?

Mr. SCHAFER. We found in our operation that we had pretty much flexibility and we found that staff and Corps, the majority are pretty much satisfied. They regard the 8 weeks as an educational opportunity for transcending monetary considerations. This is the majority, not every individual.

Mr. DELLENBACK. I recognize the unique situation in Baltimore to which you alluded, but would you give us a rough approximation of how many applicants you had for the slots kept open for a situation like that? Was it 2 to 1, or 3 to 1, or 20 to 1, or 1 to 1?

Mr. SCHAFER. About 6 to 1.

Mr. DELLENBACK. How did that work out?

Miss KNOTT. We had 72 to 5, something like that.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Seventy-five people for thirty slots?

Miss KNOTT. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So it was about a 3 to 1 situation that you were facing.

Do you have any rough idea—and I am not talking about the minutia or the trivia—but do you have any rough idea as to what the young people used the money for? Did most of them tend to save it for college or did most of them use it for their clothing or did most of them use it for social purposes? Was it a saving proposition? Was it an educational contribution or living expense proposition? Do you have any rough approximation what the pattern of utilization was?

Mr. SCHAFER. Only about individuals. One male we had, his family was on welfare and they spent money to get him prepared so his salary he used simply to live on and to help his family. The majority, it seems, used it for educational purposes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We can say legitimately—those who favor this program—that the fair share of what the young people are able to save or what they are able to be paid ends up helping to finance their education in the future?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Jeff, also going on your experience, was this true—that most of the young people tended to save and use it for education?

Mr. SAGER. I am a freshman in college.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You see the thrust of my question. I am not inquiring as to what you did with it as such, I am just trying to give Mr. Meeds and those of us who say this is a good program one more thing that we can legitimately say is one of the values that comes from this program. The dollars that go to these people are basically used to help finance future education. Is that a legitimate statement or not?

Mr. SAGER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would you say the same thing, Sue?

Miss MOSER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The majority used it for college?

Miss MOSER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DELLENBACK. May I ask one question further because you stress this idea of expansion. If, as we always find ourselves doing, you are facing the choice among alternatives, would it be more valuable that additional dollars be used to make longer programs—year-round programs—or would there be more and greater value attached to using those dollars to set up more camps?

In other words, if we doubled the money and roughly it would work to double the time for one set of young people or to make the same opportunity available to twice as many young people, which would you suggest we do?

Miss KNOTT. That is a hard one. I think year-round it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Even though fewer people participated, it would be better?

Miss KNOTT. More people could participate. As your bill has indicated, it is for a 90-day program for the enrolling and you could have—for example, you have a year-round program. If you have enrollees working for 90 days and you set it, I don't know what this might do to the continuity of the program but there is a possibility that you can involve more.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Which kind of expansion would you recommend to us, Mr. Schafer? Would you recommend expanding numbers so that

twice and three and four times as many young people could participate, or taking the same number of young people and stretching the time?

Mr. SCHAFER. I think the numbers. If it is done regardless of whether it is run 12 months or 2 months, the idea of putting more people into it—if it is 2 months within a year program, then you would have six turnovers, six different groups involved.

Mr. DELLENBACK. So the value is sufficiently greater in an 8-week period.

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You would rather see that value multiplied by increased numbers of participants?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You strongly recommend the program, Sue, to your colleagues?

Miss MOSER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Jeff, do you feel the same way?

Mr. SAGER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. You would recommend it unhesitatingly to other young people?

Mr. SAGER. Yes.

Mr. DELLENBACK. We appreciate all four of you coming but in this particular instance we think that Miss Knott and Mr. Schafer will appreciate this. I will say to you, Sue and Jeff, we don't have this as often as we would like. You did a good job. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to leave.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you for joining us this morning.

When you first talked you said you had 40 people.

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. What was the total cost of that program?

Mr. SCHAFER. $48,000.

Mr. MEEDS. So it comes up to just a little more than $1,200 per week.

Sue, how many did you have at Harpers Ferry?

Miss KNOTT. Thirty.

Mr. MEEDS. How much did that cost?

Miss KNOTT. $30,000.

Mr. MEEDS. So it comes up to a little over $1,000 per enrollee. But that is not a resident program.

Miss KNOTT. No.

Mr. MEEDS. On the other hand, you probably paid more in salaries to the Corps persons than they did at Catoctin.

Miss KNOTT. We had a spike camp experience also.

Mr. MEEDS. What?

Miss KNOTT. Spike camp which means that our budget was larger than nonresidential.

Mr. MEEDS. Tell us what that is. S-p-i-k-e?

Miss KNOTT. Yes. We sent a group of enrollees to the park to do some work there and they lived there for 2 weeks in a residential type thing. All of our 30 enrollees had a chance to participate. They come home and another group went down for 2 weeks.

Mr. MEEDS. How did that program work?

Miss KNOTT. Very successfully.

Mr. MEEDS. This is one of the things that the chairman was talking about in 1970, a base camp and then some kind of 2- or 3-week experience for everybody in that camp. Some went out in tent camps. So I am glad to hear that you have done that.

As I recall you talked about $308 per enrollee for an 8-week period. That was your salary?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. In terms of hours of work did anyone cost that out to determine how much it represented per hour of work?

Mr. SCHAFER. I believe it comes out to $4.50 a day.

Mr. MEEDS. $4.50 per day. Now included, of course, in your salary is room and board, right?

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. Anything else?

Mr. SCHAFER. No.

Mr. MEEDS. No clothes?

Mr. SCHAFER. No, sir. Helmets.

Mr. MEEDS. $4.50 per day.

Did the average day consist of more than 4 hours of work?

Mr. SCHAFER. Well, we worked on the basis of 240 hours of work.

Mr. MEEDS. 240 hours.

Mr. SCHAFER. We were in session 56 days as I recall.

Mr. MEEDS. So for $389 you did 240 hours work.

Mr. SCHAFER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. That is a little under the minimum wage.

How did the young people take that, Sue? Did they think they were being paid adequately?

Miss MOSER. Yes, the ones I talked to. They all thought it was OK as long as they got their money at the end of camp. They thought it was great.

Mr. MEEDS. You say the end of camp. Didn't they get any prior?

Miss MOSER. Yes. We could sign out $5 to $10.

Mr. MEEDS. Now of the original 40 people that went to camp with you, how many completed the 8 weeks?

Miss MOSER. All but one.

Mr. MEEDS. All but one.

Miss MOSER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. You had 1 dropout in 40 people.

How about in the Harpers Ferry program, Jeff?

Mr. SAGER. Every one.

Mr. MEEDS. Every one. Eight weeks or a little less than that.

So you had no dropout rate at all. Were both of these coeducational programs?

Miss MOSER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Was yours?

Mr. SAGER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. We understand that the dropout rate is a little higher in all male or all female groups. I don't understand why that should be, but Jeff does. [Laughter.]

Mr. Schafer, how were projects selected? Who determined whether you were going to rebuild the mill race or whether you were going to have a history program?

Mr. SCHAFER. Well, within our camp staff there is a lot of voluntary hours put in and we meet with the park people.

Mr. MEEDS. You didn't put in any hours over at Camp David, did you?

Mr. SCHAFER. No, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. Just thought I would check.

Mr. SCHAFER. We begin in the fall to work with the park staff. The park determines its priorities and then we work with them to work out a program suitable to our age group, our length of period and service. We go ahead and plan everything but don't tell anybody and then our staff comes in and they train themselves and our corpsmen come in and they train themselves. We act as advisers to get them toward the guidelines set by the park.

Mr. MEEDS. Do the young people at Catoctin have any input in projects at all of planning projects?

Mr. SCHAFER. They go around and visit all of them and then they select the project they would like to work on which they may change after 4 weeks. The first time they are at their particular worksite they plan the work project by themselves.

Mr. MEEDS. In other words, you established the broad general guideline that you are going to repair the old sawmill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Correct.

Mr. MEEDS. Then you let them help in the planning as to how you repair the old sawmill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Right.

Mr. MEEDS. What about at Harpers Ferry?

Miss KNOTT. Very much the same setup. The enrollees generally become involved in the projects and then they have an input. We listen to them on how they are going to change or anything else they see.

Mr. MEEDS. Now both of you program directors have been with the program since its inception. Do you suppose we ought to have more turnover in program directors? Is it a good idea to get fresh ideas and new blood in there?

Mr. SCHAFER. Up until this past year we found that we have had, I would say, a relatively healthy turnover in staffing. We look for people with new ideas. As Sue mentioned earlier, in our corpsmembers we have a tremendous source of new ideas.

Mr. MEEDS. I am impressed that neither one of you need replacing. If all the people who have been with the program 3 years are still as eager and affirmative about the program as you are, then it is a pretty good sign.

Jeff, could you give us any criticism of the program? It can't be all that good now.

Mr. SAGER. Well, I talked with several of the people that were in the program the first year and it seemed that maybe one or two of the projects that they had seemed to be "make work" projects to them but actually they were essential to the park.

Mr. MEEDS. What were they?

Mr. SAGER. Counting cars that came into the parking lot for the census.

Mr. MEEDS. Is that a program that somebody has to do in any event?

Mr. SAGER. It has to be done. If a corpsmember does it, it can release a ranger that can be on community relations somewhere else.

Mr. MEEDS. But in no instance was the YCC person singled out and used that way all year, were they?

Mr. SAGER. No.

Mr. MEEDS. So it may be a menial task but it is a menial task that somebody has to do and it was not just made for the corpsperson.

Mr. SAGER. No.

Mr. MEEDS. Is that what we should call them, Sue, Corpspersons? Corpsmembers? How about Corpsmen, should we call them that?

Miss MOSER. Corpsmembers.

Mr. MEEDS. Corpsmembers. All right.

You must have some criticism of the program, Sue. It is not all a bed of roses now, is it, really?

Miss MOSER. Well, in a way I thought so because I loved the work and I loved the way of life that we had up there. I just can't find any faults with it.

Mr. MEEDS. Was the food good?

Miss MOSER. Sometimes. The bag lunches, we got sort of tired of peanut butter and jelly every day. Other than that I guess that is about the only criticism.

Mr. MEEDS. Do you think you worked hard enough? Could you have worked a little harder?

Miss MOSER. Maybe toward the end of camp I could have worked a little harder.

Mr. MEEDS. How about in determining what you were going to do? Did you feel that you were treated as much of an adult as you obviously are in selecting what you wanted to do?

Miss MOSER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. You were. You selected one of the on-going programs and worked on it for 4 weeks?

Miss MOSER. Four weeks, yes.

Miss MOSER. 4 weeks, yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Tell me, how are they coming with the chronicling of the history of the Catoctin Mountain area? When I visited up there they were busily engaged interviewing some of the old mountain people there and trying to learn a little bit about the history of the area. Someone even composed a song, as I recall, about that area. Are they still doing that?

Miss MOSER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEEDS. How are they coming with the old sawmill; is it restored yet?

Miss Mc ___ I think completely, I am not sure.

Mr. SCHAFER. All the YCC part. They are waiting for the park to finish up.

Mr. MEEDS. Let me describe what happened with the group of people in my area and I would like both you and Jeff to tell me if the same kind of spirit existed in your program. One of the groups in my congressional district who had been building some trail when the program ended had not completed the work. After the program ended and without pay they all went back, every one of them, and spent 1 day each of two weekends completing the program. Was there that kind of spirit in your program and that kind of pride?

Miss MOSER. I think there was, especially among the members.

Mr. MEEDS. Not among the staff?
Miss MOSER. Most of them.
Mr. MEEDS. How about yours, Jeff?
Mr. SAGER. Yes, sir.
Mr. MEEDS. Don't you think, Sue, that you pretty well summed it up when you said that the great thing about it was that you did a job—you said, "A job I can feel proud of." Doesn't that pretty much sum it up?
Miss MOSER. I think so.
Mr. MEEDS. You want to be involved in something that you want to feel proud of.
Miss MOSER. Yes, sir.
Mr. MEEDS. Any more suggestions as to how we could improve the program by any of you?
Mr. SCHAFER. I have one.
Mr. MEEDS. Go ahead.
Mr. SCHAFER. We are in an isolated area and we had trouble getting a caterer.
Mr. MEEDS. Getting what?
Mr. SCHAFER. A food caterer.
That is one difficulty, with food. The other is the increase in cost of food. I think we are going to receive a little more per enrollee this year than last which will help some. I don't know about the logistics of this. In a short-term operation the Government surplus food, if any still exists, might be made available to the camps.
Mr. MEEDS. Unfortunately, there aren't very many surplus foods any more; you can't even get them for school lunch programs, or very little. The idea of doing something with surplus foods in this program is very good.
Were you here when I cited what the Army had done in the Washington area and the fact that in the program in my district they supplied all the cooks on a rotated basis, on a 2-week basis. Whether they were reservists doing their Reserve duty or not, I don't know. Now I didn't get a chance to talk to any of the corpsmembers to let me know if it was real Army chow. I assume that that would be a big help if some military unit could provide that.
Did you receive any support from the military in your program?
Mr. SCHAFER. Very much.
Mr. MEEDS. What type?
Mr. SCHAFER. Cables, tents. In our Baltimore program we stayed at Fort Meade for 3 days, so they were extremely helpful.
Mr. MEEDS. How about you, Sue? Did your program receive any aid?
Miss KNOTT. We got most of our vehicles from GSA.
Mr. MEEDS. But you did receive help from GSA?
Miss KNOTT, Yes.
Mr. MEEDS. Well, thanks to all of you for coming and being such excellent witnesses. Good luck to you, Sue and Sue and Jeff and Mr. Schafer. I am sure that you people understand the program. Stay right in there.
Thanks very much.
[Whereupon, at 12 noon the hearing adjourned.]

[The following statement was submitted for the record:]

TESTIMONY BY HON. LES ASPIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the distinguished members of this subcommittee for an opportunity to submit testimony on HR 8433.

I wish to express my strong support for the proposed expansion of the Youth Conservation Corps and the plan to make this a permanent program as proposed by my colleague, Rep. Lloyd Meeds (D–Wash).

The pilot Youth Conservation Corps program has proven to be a great success in Wisconsin. There are two national forests in Wisconsin operated by the Department of Agriculture, the Chequamegon National Forest and the Nicolet National Forest. Each has had the Youth Conservation Corps program for the past three summers. Nearly 475 Wisconsin youth have participated in the program.

In the two Wisconsin national forests the following types of valuable work was engaged in:

Planting of trees.
Construction of roads and bridges.
Construction of hiking trials.
Improving and maintenance of campsites.
Improvement of wildlife habitat.
Implementation of erosion control measures.
Construction of boat landings.
Improvement of stream banks.

Not only has the Youth Conservation Corps improved Wisconsin national forests but it has provided valuable work experience for our youth who otherwise would have been without needed summer jobs. The program has also helped to create an awareness and understanding of our environment within the participants.

The public demand for use of our public resources has been steadily increasing. As a result every year the backlog of work to be done on our public lands increases. The Youth Conservation Corps provides a means for trying to catch up with the demands.

The federal-state cost sharing provisions of the bill wound be an enormous benefit for Wisconsin. The state has 28 state parks and 10 state forest with a total acreage of nearly 475,000 acres. Making the program available for state participation would enable Wisconsin to improve its vast public resources in a manner that the federal government has found so beneficial.

I encourage you to give the proposed expansion of the Youth Conservation Corps your utmost consideration.